

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **28 July 2006**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-17 and 19-28. Claims 1-6, 9-11, 13-17, and 19-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bly et al. (U.S. Pub 2002/0077944, hereinafter “Bly.”), in view of Holt et al. (USPN 6,601,061 hereinafter “Holt”), and further in view of Harris (US Pub. No. 2002/0059204 hereinafter “Harris”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 14, 15, 22, and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bly in view of Holt, and further in view of Harris.

Applicant respectfully points out that Holt discloses merging the results of the searches into a combined search result (see Holt, abstract and claim 1), but does not disclose presenting the results of the search to the user using a single interface.

In contrast, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention teaches **presenting the combined results of the remote and local searches employing a single interface**. The present invention further teaches that the single interface employed for displaying results is the interface that is employed at the local search (see page 3, lines 11-13, page 13, lines 11-12, and FIG. 2, box 220 of the instant application). In addition, presenting the results using a single interface may involve reformatting the results of the remote searches to match the local search results (see page 13, lines 10-13 of the instant application). The Applicant respectfully submits that merging the results into a combined single

result, as disclosed by Holt, does not imply reformatting the results for uniform display that is familiar to the user.

This is beneficial because it **offers transparency** to the user about the actual local and remote searches that are conducted by the system in response to the user request. In addition, external searches may yield results that are presented to the user in unfamiliar interfaces, requiring the user to spend time and effort in becoming familiar with these varying external interfaces (see page 2, lines 11-15 of the instant application).

There is nothing in Bly, Holt, or Harris, separately or in concert that teaches presenting the results of the external and local searches to the user using in a single interface.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 15, and 22 to clarify that the present invention teaches presenting the merged results to the user through a single interface. These amendments find support on page 2, lines 11-15, page 3, lines 11-13, page 13, lines 10-13, and FIG. 2, box 220 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14-15, and 22-23 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-6, 9-11, 13 and 26, which depend upon claim 1, claims 16-21, and 27 which depend upon claim 15, and claims 24-25, and 28 which depend upon claim 23, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 30 August 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com